

### Promotions in Board High Schools of South Kanara District

19. Sri P. V. AITHALA (Suratkal).—

Will the Minister for Development be pleased to state :—

(a) whether it has come to the notice of Government that up to 7th July 1969, promotions to the posts of Head-Masters in the Board High Schools of South Kanara District, which came to be managed by the respective Taluk Boards since 1st October 1962 were controlled by the Deputy Commissioner, South Kanara, on a Districtwise seniority basis, under the provisions of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 ;

(b) whether two posts of Head Masters have recently been filled up one in Karkala Taluk and the other in Coondapur, ignoring the Districtwise seniority list and seniority of 4 Teachers ;

(c) whether while transferring the Schools to the management of Taluk Boards from the control of the Deputy Commissioner, assurances were given that until the new rules are framed for the Administration of High Schools by Taluk Boards, the conditions of promotions, etc.; of teachers would be governed by the old rules ;

(d) whether the new rules have been framed, if not, how the two appointments were made, ignoring the districtwise seniority list, and in violation of the old rules ;

(e) whether after 1966, the award of promotional grade to senior Graduate Assistants and Pandits of Board High Schools of S. K. District. has been suspended although there are five vacancies in the cadre of Senior Graduate Assistants and 3 vacancies in the Pandits cadre due to the promotion or retirement of senior teachers and if so, the reasons for the same ?

Sri P. M. NADGOUDA (Minister for Development).—

(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

(d) No. In view of the decision of the High Court of Mysore holding that the Taluk Board is also the appointing authority in respect of Head Masters of the High Schools under their control, the concerned Boards have made the appointments having taken into consideration the Talukwise seniority.

(e) No.

Sri P. V. AITHALA.—The High Court has held that Taluk Board is also an appointing authority for Headmasters. It has not held that the districtwise seniority list should be overlooked or that the taluk board seniority list should be observed. That being so, may I know why the districtwise seniority list has been overlooked ?

† Sri P. M. NADGOUDA.—The High Court has held that taluk boards are the appointing authority and as such taluk boards can make such appointments till uniform law is formulated.

Sri P. V. AITHALA.—My point is that the High Court has not held that the districtwise seniority list should be overlooked or that the taluk board seniority list should be strictly observed. It has only held that the taluk board is also an appointing authority for headmasters. That means there is another authority also. Why then the districtwise seniority list has been overlooked? Is it because the seniors according to that list, are not Congressmen?

Sri P. M. NADGOUDA.—As the member puts it, when the High Court has held that the taluk boards in their area can make appointments because they are the appointing authority for the taluk and because their jurisdiction is limited to the taluk area, it would be against the spirit of the decision of the High Court to go according to the districtwise seniority list.

Sri P. V. AITHALA.—An assurance was given by Government while transferring the district board schools from the management of the Deputy Commissioner to taluk boards, that all their service rules and regulations and their rights will be preserved and they will be recognised. In spite of that assurance, when the High Court has not held that the districtwise seniority list cannot be observed and when the High Court has also not held that talukwise seniority list should be framed, why the districtwise seniors are not promoted?

Sri P. M. NADGOUDA.—It is a fact that Government has assured that the seniority of the headmasters of the Board schools should be taken into account on a districtwise basis, but on account of the decision of the High Court we cannot take a decision against the spirit of the decision of the High Court.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಪಾಲ್ವನಯ್ಯ.—ಈಗ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಹೈಸ್ಕೂಲುಗಳಿಗೂ ಸೆಂಟ್ ಪರ್ರೆಂಟ್ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಸ್ಕೂಲುಗಳಿಗೂ ಇದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಡೆಪ್ಯೂಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರನ್ನು ಯುನಿಟ್ ಆಫೀಸರ್ ಆಗಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಏಜ್ಯುಕೇಷನ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ಗೂ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಕ್ಲಾಷ್ ಆಗಿ ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆ 10—15 ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ ಟ್ರಾನ್ಸ್‌ಫರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಯುನಿಟಾರಂ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಫೈಂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಎಂ. ನಾಡಗೌಡ.—ವಾನ್ಯ ಸವಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಪಂಚಾಯ್ತಿರಾಜ್ಯದ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಮಿಸ್ಟೇಕ್ಸ್, ರಾಕ್ಯುನಾ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ರಿಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—The Hon. Minister stated in his reply that the High Court has held that the Taluk Board is empowered to make appointments, "Empowered" does not mean that the High Court has given a direction as to who should be appointed and who should not be appointed. Proper person must be appointed. The senior most person should be appointed and not any person with a trade mark or a cap.

**Sri P. M. NADGOUDA.**—The Taluk Board has taken into consideration all the suggestions made by the hon. Member and it has appointed the senior man in the taluk.

**Sri V. N. PATIL.**—My point is, why did you not take into consideration the districtwise seniority list and appoint the most merited person ?

**Sri P. M. NADGOUDA.**—It is not Government that does it. It is the Taluk Board that has done it. Naturally the Taluk Board cannot take the seniority of the whole district into consideration because its jurisdiction is limited to the area of the taluk and accordingly it has taken into consideration the seniority list of teachers in the taluk.

### **Agreement for the Supply of Steel Sections between Mysore Iron and Steel Limited and M/s. Steel Enterprises, Madras.**

**20. Sri C. K. RAJIAH SHETTY** (Chicknaikanahalli).—

Will the Minister for Industries, Information and Publicity be pleased to state :—

(a) whether the Mysore Iron and Steel Limited had any agreement with M/s. Steel Enterprises, (Private), Limited, Madras, for the supply of Steel section and if so, for how much ;

(b) the terms of delivery ;

(c) the total quantity of steel sections supplied so far ;

(d) whether there was any concession given in the prevailing prices; if so, by how much ?

**Sri A. P. APPANNA** (Deputy Minister for Industries).—

(a) Only an Order Acceptance Memo was issued on 15th January 1969 to M/s. Steel Enterprises in reply to their indent for supply of a quantity of 20,288 m. tonnes of M.S. Sections. The acceptance was subject to the usual terms and conditions viz., that the fulfilment of the order was subject to productions and availability of the material. One of the conditions was that Mysore Iron and Steel Limited, had reserved the right to revoke or cancel the order without notice.

(b) The terms of delivery were that the materials should be despatched in accordance with instructions to be received from time to time from the Purchaser.

(c) 5,373.60 tonnes.

(d) The concessions given were as follows :

(A) The prices were f.o.r. destination instead of f. o. r. Bhadravati.